OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

# ERIC REPORT RESUME

| ERIC ACC. NO. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ED 032 330 | | | | |
| CH ACC. NO. | P.A. | PUBL. DATE | ISSUE | |
| TE 499 927 | 24 | 18 Jul 69 | RIEJAN70 | |

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Moore, Jerry R.

TITLE
Experimental Statewide Seminars in Teaching About Democracy and Totalitarianism. Final Report.

| SOURCE CODE | INSTITUTION (SOURCE) |
|---|---|
| JIM64350 | |
| SP. AG. CODE | SPONSORING AGENCY |
| RMQ66004 | |

| EDRS PRICE | CONTRACT NO. | GRANT NO. |
|---|---|---|
| 0.25;2.45 | OEC-5-10-251 | |
| REPORT NO. | | BUREAU NO. |
| | | BR-5-0685 |

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
47p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Social Studies; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Seminars; *Democracy; *Communism; Political Attitudes; Civics; Social Studies Units; Secondary Education; Political Science; Political Issues; Nationalism; Democratic Values; Political Influences

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
To improve social studies instruction and curriculum content in the United States, Northwestern University and the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project conducted 14 experimental seminars (1964-69) in which 894 teachers and administrators from 25 states took part. To determine the effectiveness of the seminars, two surveys were taken, one after the fourth seminar and one after the last. In the first survey, 30 educators agreed that the seminars had been effective in producing curriculum revisions and that they had changed teacher attitudes. In the other, 96 participants representing all seminars indicated that they (1) responded favorably to the "status and involvement roles" afforded by the seminars, (2) took part, in their own schools, in the preparation of social studies curriculums and of units on democracy and totalitarianism, (3) brought fresh ideas into the curriculums from the seminar, (4) applied the informed opinions of university specialists and scholars to their educational situations, and (5) incorporated new materials and approaches directly into the social studies curriculum. (MP)

GPO 870-390

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR 5-068
PA 24
OE/BR

ED032330

FINAL REPORT

PROJECT NO. G-022 (No. 5-0685)
GRANT or CONTRACT NO. OE 5-10-251

TITLE OF REPORT

# Experimental Statewide Seminars in Teaching About Democracy and Totalitarianism

NAME OF AUTHOR

Dr. Jerry R. Moore, Director

INSTITUTION

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
Foreign Relations Project

Chicago, Illinois

July 18, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgments in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TE 499 927

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

## SUMMARY

In 1964, Northwestern University and the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project received a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Project No. G-022 Contract No. OE 5-10-251, to conduct a series of experimental statewide seminars on the teaching of democracy and totalitarianism. Under the terms of this contract eleven (11) such seminars were conducted between September, 1964, and January, 1967, involving more than five hundred forty (540) social studies teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, and social scientists from more than eighteen (18) states.

Following the fourth seminar in the series, the Foreign Relations Project surveyed participating educators to determine receptivity to the seminar method and to estimate the impact of the seminar series on teaching behaviors and curriculum content. The essential points of the interim report were:

1. Respondents felt that the topic "Democracy and Totalitarianism" was very important and relevant, if not critical.

2. Participants agreed that the opportunity to hear informed opinions from university specialists and scholars was exciting and generated enthusiasm for teaching the subject.

3. The seminar focused upon objective approaches to the study of democratic and totalitarian societies.

4. New materials, approaches and content were discussed and in many cases, directly implemented into social studies curricula.

It was, and remains difficult to assess the total impact of the seminar series; sampling classroom effects is at best a challenge in measurement. Frequently reported were comments such as "the lectures provided us with many different means to the same end--from the historical to the application of behavioral sciences in the teaching of the topic. The seminar recharged my intellectual batteries."

On August 25-26, 1966, under the first extension of the original contract, the Foreign Relations Project staff convened a two-day evaluation conference at Zion, Illinois. Thirty educators, who had attended one or more of the Democracy and Totalitarianism Seminars, were asked to candidly evaluate: 1) The success of the seminars in view of stated objectives; 2) the structure of the seminar program and selection of participants; 3) The lectures and demonstration sessions; 4) The discussion sessions; and 5) The instructional materials made available to participants.

The conferees agreed that the Democracy and Totalitarianism Seminars had been effective in producing curriculum change. Furthermore, it was suggested that curriculum revision taking place is assessable in part to the seminar series. Examples of changes in secondary schools include: 1) Total reassessment of the social studies curriculum; 2) Adding new units on democracy and totalitarianism to current offerings; 3) Refinement in teaching concepts concerning democratic and totalitarian values; 4) Developing new approaches in teaching, including the use of new materials.

SUMMARY - Continued

While the evaluation seminar provided insights into better methods of programming seminars, necessary structural planning, and the receptivity of short but intensive seminars, certain other observations are pertinent to the series. First, the cost per participant, estimated on the basis of the first eight seminars, was substantially less than one hundred dollars ($100). Secondly, social studies teachers and school administrators came directly from their schools to attend the seminars; a condition that provided for immediate curriculum planning and promoted dissemination of information among professional colleagues. Thirdly, participants did not receive a grade, college credit, or pay for their involvement. As persons equally concerned with instructional aspects of democracy and totalitarianism, social studies teachers, school administrators, and scholars freely exchanged ideas about methods of instruction, curriculum planning, and concepts presented in existing materials. On several occasions, participants have remarked that the Democracy and Totalitarianism Seminars helped them feel that they were truly "professional." Lastly, the free interchange of ideas among participants suggest that the short seminar method opens channels of communication between secondary school and university personnel that are essential for updating social studies instruction. Short, inexpensive seminars on specialized topics provide stimulation to a broad spectrum of personnel over a significant geographical area.

During the period November, 1966, and January, 1969, an additional seven (7) seminars were held reflecting variations in the central focus under the general title of Democracy and Totalitarianism. That is at various times the focus was more sharply defined as "Value Issues in a Free Society."

Between September, 1964, and January, 1969, eight hundred and ninety-four (894) educators participated in fourteen seminars. The participants represented school systems, institutions of higher education, and state departments of public instruction originating in twenty-five (25) different states. A sampling of ninety-six (96) participants--crossing all fourteen seminars and occupational positions--was conducted in March, 1969. The results of the survey tended to support the following generalizations:

1. Personnel components of the educational system responded to the status and involvement roles projected by the seminar technique.

2. Commitment to active participation in the curriculum process in the social studies appeared to be significantly higher than the generally observed level in the typical school milieu.

3. Seminar involvement permitted the identification of personnel at all levels of educational strata capable of generating fresh ideas into curricula. Identifications of this type provided important channels for more efficient utilization of talents.

## BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Following the advent of the "Cold War" and associative phenomena that accompanied it, social studies educators--particularly classroom teachers --were faced with a serious problem. Secondary school students of the 1950's and 1960's had been and continued to be students of Western history, culture, and institutions. Comparative ideologies, economic systems, cultures, etc., were rare courses for the high school student in social studies; in fact, it was exceedingly rare if the teachers themselves had been exposed to studies that explored more than traditional institutions and cultures.

The "Cold War"--the concomitant emergence of super-powers--raised a hue and cry for courses on communism. Extremely emotional patriots demanded that youth be endoctrinated against the evils of communism, while others began to argue for studies that would help Americans understand the communist system. The time was ripe for the introduction of intellectually legitimate studies that could open doors for new teaching strategies, new social science materials, and translation of recent research in the social sciences.

By 1964, materials on the communist ideology and totalitarian models were being produced by a number of publishers. Political models of totalitarian systems had been well developed in the scholarly community to be compared to the wide range of democratic models. However, in 1964, the secondary curriculum, always slow to reflect advances in new knoweldge, did not contain much reference to the Eastern world or the Eastern bloc of nations let alone the dynamic penetration of the Soviet Union into international affairs. Several conditions obtained to forestall courses that roamed beyond the frontiers of Ancient Rome, Western Europe, and the United States:

1) Classroom teachers often felt inadequate to explore subject areas and social science processes that they had not studied in their pre-service preparation.

2) The community climate--generally untested--raised a spectre of fear reminescent of the McCarthy era.

3) Finally, social studies teachers were noticeably unaware of the possibilities in materials and knowledge that had emerged since their preparation for the classroom.

However, a principal question remained. By what process could classroom teachers be:

1) Encouraged to expand the social studies to include cross-cultural and cross-national comparisons; studies that would go beyond the parameters of Western societies.

2) Informed of social science research and instructional models that could be accurately translated into secondary social studies.

3) Supported against the uncritical attacks of persons critical of studies involving totalitarian and communist models.

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY - Continued

4) Made aware of the new instructional materials that could be utilized in presenting intellectually sound studies of comparative ideologies.

The North Central Association Foreign Relations Project with Northwestern University secured a grant from the U.S. Office of Education to actively intervene into the curriculum process of the social studies. The plans called for financial support to hold eight (8), three-day residential seminars on the study of "Democracy and Totalitarianism." /Actually, fourteen (14) were held from the original grant./ The seminars were to be scheduled in key resource centers--normally university centers--where social studies educators--change agent curriculum leaders--could develop strategies to promote reasoned and modern studies of comparative ideological systems.

The objectives of these experimental seminars were as follows:

1) To identify some of the problems in teaching about democracy and totalitarianism.

2) To enable scholars to convey some of the latest research on democratic and totalitarian countries to the secondary schools.

3) To examine materials available in this field for teachers and students.

4) To explore materials available in this field for teachers and students.

5) To consider where and when a study of democracy and totalitarianism should be included in the curriculum.

6) To establish greater communication among teachers, administrators, and college faculty so that the instruction in this area and others could be improved.

7)To encourage those attending the conference to evaluate their situation and make the necessary changes.

8) To disseminate reports reflecting the procedure and recommendations of each seminar in order to inform people not attending of the developments in this area, and

10) To demonstrate the seminar method as an effective means for exploring existing materials and for developing alternative approaches to the study of democracy and totalitarianism.

## METHODS

The seminars were basically conducted on a standardized format. That is, of the three days for the seminar one generally fell on a weekend--the teachers' contribution--while two days were weekdays--contributed in most cases by the school system. While teachers did not receive pay for their participation, they were given room and board.

A typical seminar schedule appears on Pages Five and Six. In the expository mode there were three addresses presented by social science specialists and one demonstration of new instructional strategies. Considerable time was given to interactions with the speakers and with colleagues--small discussion sessions; as well as time to view a large display of instructional materials related to the topic.

While the size of each seminar varied, the ideal size actively sought was sixty (60)--or a sufficient number of participants for four small discussion groups. The average number of participants for the fourteen (14) seminars was sixty-four (64).

The participant list contained four basic professional groups--67% classroom teachers; 9% supervisors and administrators; 21% college faculty; and 3% state department of public instruction personnel.

Each seminar was held on or near a major university as indicated by the Table on Page Six.

In addition to the major colleges and universities serving as hosts, local organizations that typically cooperated included:

-state departments of education
-social studies councils
-private organizations
-state historical associations

Speakers in the eleven (11) seminars represented such social science disciplines as history, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy.

A TYPICAL SEMINAR AGENDA APPEARS AS FOLLOWS:

**SUNDAY**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. | Registration |
| 4:00 - 4:30 p.m. | Welcome, introductions, orientation |
| 4:40 - 5:45 p.m. | General Session<br>Speaker -- "The Power of the Democratic Idea" |
| 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. | Dinner |
| 7:30 - 9:00 p.m. | Discussion Sessions -- Implications of speakers remarks for teaching about democracy. |

**MONDAY**

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:15 a.m. | General Session<br>Speaker -- "Totalitarianism-Challenge to Democracy" |

A TYPICAL SEMINAR AGENDA - Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| 10:15 - 10:30 a.m. | Break |
| 10:30 - 12:00 p.m. | Discussion Sessions -- Approaches to teaching about democracy and totalitarianism. |
| 12:00 - 1:00 p.m. | Lunch |
| 1:30 - 2:45 p.m. | General Session<br>Speaker -- "Some bases for Comparing Political and Social Systems" |
| 2:45 - 3:00 p.m. | Break |
| 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. | Discussion Sessions -- Materials and methods in teaching about democracy and totalitarianism. |
| 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. | Dinner |
| 7:30 - 9:00 p.m. | General Session -- Films, audio-visual aides, mass media and teaching about democracy and communism. |

TUESDAY

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:15 a.m. | General Session<br>Speaker -- "Russian Communism and International Affairs" |
| 10:15 - 10:30 a.m. | Break |
| 10:30 - 12:00 p.m. | Discussion Sessions -- Recommendations, suggestions and conclusions on teaching about democracy and totalitarianism. |
| 12:00 - 1:00 p.m. | Lunch |
| 1:30 - 4:00 p.m. | General Session -- Presentation, discussion, revision and approval of summary report of seminar. |
| 4:00 p.m. | Adjourn. |

The geographic distribution of the seminars was as follows:

| DATE | LOCATION | LOCAL SPONSOR |
|---|---|---|
| December 6-8, 1964 | Zion, Illinois | Northwestern University |
| February 7-9, 1965 | Monticello, Illinois | University of Illinois |
| March 14-16, 1965 | Bloomington, Indiana | Indiana University |
| April 4-6, 1965 | Lawrence, Kansas | University of Kansas |
| October 17-19, 1965 | Eau Clare, Wisconsin | University of Minnesota-Wisconsin State University |
| November 14-16, 1965 | Lincoln, Nebraska | University of Nebraska |
| March 31-April 2, 1966 | Columbus, Ohio | Ohio State University |
| April 27-29, 1966 | East Lansing, Michigan | Michigan State Department of Education-Michigan State University |
| November 3-5, 1966 | Moorhead, Minnesota | Moorhead State College-North Dakota State University |
| December 18-20, 1966 | Middletown, Connecticut | Wesleyan University-Connecticut College |
| Janauary 29-31, 1967 | Lincoln, Nebraska | Nebraska State Department of Education-University of Nebraska |

The geographic distribution of the seminars - Continued

| DATE | LOCATION | LOCAL SPONSOR |
|---|---|---|
| April 10, 1967 | Brookings, South Dakota | South Dakota State University |
| May 18-19, 1967 | Terre Haute, Indiana | Indiana State University |
| November 9-10, 1967 | Iowa City, Iowa | State University of Iowa |
| January 19-21, 1969 | Morgantown, West Virginia | West Virginia University-West Virginia State Department of Education |

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

| | Total Participants | State Department of Education | Classroom Teachers | College | Supervisors & Administrators | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Zion, 1964 | 38 | 2 | 18 | 10 | 8 | |
| Illinois - 1965 | 52 | 2 | 34 | 13 | 3 | |
| Indiana - 1965 | 78 | 2 | 57 | 11 | 8 | |
| Kansas - 1965 | 44 | - | 34 | 8 | 2 | |
| Wisconsin - 1965 | 45 | 2 | 27 | 15 | 1 | |
| Nebraska - 1965 | 52 | 1 | 30 | 11 | 10 | |
| Ohio - 1966 | 38 | 1 | 26 | 9 | 2 | |
| Michigan - 1966 | 89 | 5 | 48 | 25 | 11 | |
| Minnesota - 1966 | 40 | - | 23 | 12 | 5 | |
| Connecticut - 1966 | 48 | - | 36 | 11 | 1 | |
| Nebraska - 1967 | 73 | 4 | 58 | 11 | - | |
| South Dakota - 1967 | 41 | - | 36 | 4 | 1 | |
| Terre Haute - 1967 | 27 | - | 15 | 8 | 4 | |
| Iowa - 1967 | 64 | 1 | 49 | 8 | 6 | |
| West Virginia - 1969 | 75 | 3 | 37 | 18 | 17 | |
| TOTALS | 804 | 23 | 528 | 174 | 79 | |

Representative of the list of scholars participating were:

William Ebenstein, Department of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara;

John Thompson, Department of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana;

Fred A. Greenstein, Department of Political Science, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut;

Representative of the list of scholars participating - Continued

Gwendolen Carter, African Studies Program, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois;
Sheldon Stryker, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana;
Russell Moran, Department of Economics, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois; and
Richard De George, Department of Philosophy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Seminar participants were invited by personal letter. Names of prospective participants were compiled from lists of change-agent personnel submitted by state departments of public instruction, colleges and universities, social studies councils, and other supportive groups and agencies. It was deemed desirable to have a broad range of talent represented in an effort to produce teams of personnel capable of producing curriculum development. Further, a dialogue among different strata of educators was deemed essential to meaningful participation.

During the seminar, participant recorders collected data on major points presented during addresses, demonstrations, or discussions. Compilation of these notes were printed as final reports of the seminar and were distributed throughout the North Central Association area as well as other areas of the United States.

Evaluating the impact of the seminars was to be conducted by a survey of the participants in attendance. The first survey was conducted following the fourth seminar in the series /the survey and interim report appear in the Appendix/. Following the eighth seminar, an evaluation conference was convened where participants analyzed the seminar series. /A copy of this report appears in the Appendix/. A final survey, sampling all types of participants representing each of the fourteen (14) seminars was conducted in March, 1969. In addition, descriptive accounts of events resulting from the seminars have been collected and reported.

## FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

### A. INTERIM REPORT

Four seminars were held during the 1964-65 school year: Zion-Illinois Beach State Park Lodge (December, 1964); Allerton House, University of Illinois (February, 1965); Indiana University (March, 1965); University of Kansas (April, 1965).

A total of 204 persons participated in the first four Seminars on Democracy and Totalitarianism. Of these, 103 were teachers; 33 were administrators or persons responsible for the social studies curriculum on a school district or citywide level; and more than 51 represented colleges and universities. It should also be noted that the state departments of public instruction were well represented at each Seminar.

#### Survey

In May, 1965, the NCA Foreign Relations Project mailed a questionnaire to all participants. The questionnaire does not purport to be a highly refined instrument; it was designed merely to give Northwestern University and the Foreign Relations Project a general idea of participants' reactions to the Seminars, to provide a rough estimate of the impact these Seminars have had on participants and their behavior in their classrooms, and to check out major areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for planning the 1965-66 series of Seminars.

A total of 117 questionnaires were returned: 70 from teachers, 22 from college personnel, and 22 from all other categories.

#### Reactions of High School Teachers

Of the 70 teachers who returned questionnaires, nearly all were from public high schools, although laboratory, private, and parochial schools were represented. Most (63) teach courses in U.S. History or Government; some (24) teach World History or World Civilizations; and a few listed courses in Economics, International Relations, Geography, Problems, and various types of History. A substantial majority (60) of teachers include a unit on Communism or on a communist state somewhere in their courses. For many, the Seminar constituted their first experience with a lecture-discussion conference. The following is a summary of their reactions to the Seminars, insofar as these can be induced from the questionnaires.

Virtually every teacher affirmed that the Seminar had been a successful experience. Exactly why the Seminars were successful may be difficult to specify, but some factors may be identified:

1) Relevance to the topic. All respondents felt that the topic "Democracy and Totalitarianism" was very important, if not critical.

2) The caliber and contributions of university specialists and scholars. The opportunity to hear informed opinions on such topics as the nature of totalitarianism, the democratic process, the advantages and disadvantages of model-building, current

FINDINGS AND ANLYSIS - Continued

developments in the Soviet Union, or the historical roots of communism was, for most teachers, an unusual and very exciting experience, an experience that not only imparted knowledge, but also generated fresh enthusiasm for the subject. Forty-seven teachers felt, in fact, that the lectures should be published and made available to other teachers; twenty-one believed that the lectures, if recorded on tape, could be useful to selected students.

Discussion Sessions

Although lectures created the greatest stir, the treatment of methods and techniques elicited some of the most pointed comments and suggestions from the teachers. As interested as they were by the speakers, they were equally concerned, sometimes even more so, by the question: How do we transmit this information and these sophisticated concepts to students in a form they can understand? The most frequently made suggestions concerning topics for future Seminars or ways in which the Seminars could be improved were those relating to pedagogy. Quite a few said that they would favor the inclusion in future Seminars of an entire session devoted to the presentation of classroom techniques and methods. Few, however, believed that such a session should supplant a lecture: most favored adding it to the program, or, in a few cases, replacing one discussion session.

The discussion sessions proved to be worthwhile and provocative, though not without their drawbacks. Most of the teachers were eager for the opportunity to talk over mutual problems with others in similar situations, as well as to exchange ideas and points of view with college and university professors, school administrators and state department of public instruction personnel. Although the quality and form of the discussion groups varied greatly according to time, group composition, and discussion leaders, a majority of teachers replied that the discussions had been "stimulating." A slightly fewer number considered them "useful and practical."

While it may not represent significant or widespread dissatisfaction with the discussion sessions, there was some genuine frustration. The most frequently voiced criticism was that the sessions were "too loosely structured." It should be noted that the sponsors of the Seminars had been anxious to avoid rigidity in the discussion groups, and while suggested discussion questions had been provided and distributed, discussion leaders were instructed not to stifle a promising or lively discussion simply for the sake of conforming to the suggested pattern. It may be however, that the planners went too far in their desire to maintain flexibility, and that a tighter framework would have resulted in more germane and more productive discussions. Several teachers also suggested rotating or shifting discussion groups, so that participants would be with different people for at least some of the sessions. (Such a procedure would have the advantages of minimizing repetitiveness, though it might increase the difficulties caused by unfamiliarity and reticence in a new group).

Books and Other Materials

Background preparation was considered essential by the planners of the

Books and Other Materials - Continued

Seminars, and several weeks before the Seminar participants received two short books: THE POWER OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA, Rockefeller Panel Report No. 6, and TOTALITARIANISM: NEW PERSPECTIVES, by William Ebenstein. Nearly all the teachers reported having read the books before coming to the Seminar, although a few said they read them afterwards, and a scattering had read them both before and after the Seminar. The Ebenstein book seems to have proven slightly more adaptable as classroom material, since a few more teachers (57) reported having passed it on to selected students or excerpted portions for class readings than had done the same for THE POWER OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA (52). In addition, a slighly greater number of teachers said they intended to use the Ebenstein book in future classes -- 42 as opposed to 37 for the Rockefeller Report.

In addition to these two books, a variety of books, pamphlets, bibliographies, curriculum guides, and outlines were displayed at the Seminars Howard Mehlinger's COMMUNISM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE: A BOOK OF READINGS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS was distributed; and at Allerton House, a special evening session was devoted to a discussion of the Illinois Curriculum Program's manual: TEACHING ABOUT TOTALITARIAN COMMUNISM. Many teachers reported using such materials, as well as the materials distributed before the Seminars, to enrich their courses, to supplement library holdings in the field, or to pass on to other members of their departments. In this way, the Seminars served as clearing houses of information, and may have been able to make a direct and immediate impact on the classes of those teachers who attended. At the same time, however, the fact that about half the teachers evaluated the display of materials as "somewhat useful" (as opposed to "very useful") gives the impression that future displays could be improved.

Allocation of Time

Item 8 of the questionnaire requested teachers to evaluate the time allotment for seven phases of the Seminar: lectures, discussion sessions, free time, treatment of totalitarianism, treatment of democracy, discussion of lecture, and discussion of pedagogy. Most teachers were generally satisfied with the amount of time spent on lectures and free time. On other aspects, however, opinions were split. About 50 percent of those responding for example, approved of the total time spent in discussion sessions; of the remainder, 25 percent thought that discussions should be longer, and 25 percent shorter. Twenty-five teachers thought that discussions should have focused more on the lectures, while 29 were satisfied, and 16 preferred less discussion of the lectures. And while a number of teachers (24) thought that discussion of pedagogy merited more attention than it received, almost as many (23) felt that it deserved LESS, and 18 believed that it was good as it was. A substantial minority would have preferred the treatment of democracy, as well as that of totalitarianism, to have been greater. These responses seem to suggest little in the way of specific changes, since opinions as to the allocation of time are so divided.

Suggestions for Future Seminars

The answers to item 16, "How can future Seminars on Democracy and

Suggestions for Future Seminars - Continued

Totalitarianism be improved?" generally reiterated criticisms and opinions expressed elsewhere in the questionnaire. Several participants suggested having teachers bring to the Seminars outlines of their courses to facilitate the sharing of specific objectives and methods. A number of other proposals were concerned with improving discussion groups, either by making them smaller, extending the time spent in them, rotating them to allow different participants to come in contact with each other, or making them more tightly structured.

Teachers suggested various topics that might be included in future Seminars, although here too, opinions were quite scattered. Several proposals did tend to recur, however: sessions or presentations on pedagogical methods; area studies of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Far East, or Eastern Europe; the historical origins of totalitarianism; the economics of totalitarian states; fascism; and various topics related to strengths and weaknesses in American democracy (extremist groups, the problem of community attitudes, the problem of "democracy in the classroom").

Impact of the Seminar in the Classroom

Perhaps the most difficult question to answer was "Did participation in the Seminar affect your teaching about democracy and totalitarianism? If so, please describe." The vagueness of many of the replies probably reflects this difficulty; the improvement in the quality and tone of teaching may be hard to perceive and harder to articulate. Nevertheless, many teachers did speak of specific ways in which new information and insights, as well as new books and tapes, had been added to existing courses. The lectures, for example, provided many of the teachers with a wealth of information and new approaches, to use in teaching about totalitarianism or totalitarian states. One teacher reported having distributed summaries of the lectures to his departmental colleagues; another had used tapes of the lectures in classes. Many others became aware of the multiplicity of approaches that might be used in treating the subjects of democracy and totalitarianism. As one participant put it, "Certainly the lectures provided us with many different means to the same end -- from the historical to the application of behavioral sciences in the teaching of the topic. It recharged my intellectual batteries." Furthermore, a number of teachers had changed the emphasis of a course or unit, or had even restructured courses and units as a result of the information and materials gained at the Seminars. One teacher, for example, changed a unit from a study of the Soviet Union to a broader treatment of the nature of the totalitarian state; another expanded the study of communism to a more general investigation of totalitarian systems; a third participant reported changing the emphasis of a course in International Relations to give greater stress to the ideological aspects of the United States' relations with various other countries;and still another teacher had introduced units on totalitarianism in the study of Russia and China. Several other teachers said they were using new information and materials to help plan future courses and programs. One teacher, for example, stated that he planned to work with a university participant at the Seminar in developing the ideas presented there into a unit for secondary school use.

Impact of the Seminar in the Classroom - Continued

The Seminars seem also to have refined the thinking and heightened the political sophistication of many of the teachers. At least three stated explicitly that they had gained objectivity, or had discarded some of the biases and stereotypes they had previously held concerning totalitarianism or totalitarian states. The stress that many of the speakers placed upon the differences among totalitarian states, as well as upon the changes that can take place within a supposedly monolithic state over a period of time, helped create a subtly shaded picture of totalitarianism and an appreciation of the range of variation among totalitarian states.

In general, the impressions created by the responses to this question are of renewed vitality, heightened interest, fresh ideas and activities, and the reassessment of old courses, materials, activities, and points of view. In a number of cases, the information gained from the readings and lectures seems to have been directly incorporated into courses and units; in other instances, the impact of the Seminars appears to be more intangible but equally essential; namely, the greater objectivity and sophistication with which teachers are presenting sensitive topics and difficult concepts.

Responses of Other Participants

So few questionnaires were returned by any single other category of participants it is difficult to hazzard many generalizations concerning their reactions to and criticisms of the Seminars.

It can probably be safely stated, though, that the college and university professors found the Seminars as enlightening as did the high school teachers, although for very different reasons. Many of the professors were, perhaps for the first time, brought face to face with the unique problems involved in teaching about democracy and totalitarianism on a high school level. Some of them no doubt came to appreciate the difficulty of teaching complex and sophisticated topics in a way in which high school students can understand, but which at the same time does not distort or oversimplify the subjects. Others heard accounts of adverse community reactions to courses about communism, the Soviet Union, or China, and of the pressures sometimes brought to bear upon teachers to adhere to a certain "line". The college and university professors also began to realize the trouble teachers have in finding time, amid the demands of extracurricular duties and heavy teaching loads, to read current books and articles in their special fields. This last realization may have convinced some of the college-level teachers that they, too, have a role in helping improve high school education by conducting workshops, acting as consultants, or preparing bibliographies. One university professor said that the Seminar had made him "more aware of misconceptions which had to be answered -- and a lack of knowledge on both democracy and totalitarianism on the part of both teachers and students. Consequently in my teaching I have taken more pains to deal with the issues at greater length and in more detail".

Curriculum supervisors, school administrators, and state department of public instruction personnel, though with much smaller representation at the Seminars in comparison to that of high school and college teachers,

Responses of Other Participants - Continued

nevertheless were often in a position to influence greatly the planning of new programs in line with the ideas presented at Seminars. Several administrators reported having encouraged their staffs to concentrate more heavily on the subjects of democracy and totalitarianism. A state department official and an administrator both said that the Seminar had influenced them to work for in-service programs. And another member of a state department reported that the Seminar experience had influenced plans for summer institutes.

## B. EVALUATION CONFERENCE

On August 25 and 26, 1966, a select group of educators, who had attended one or more of the eight seminars on democracy and totalitarianism, met at Illinois Beach State Park Lodge to evaluate the Seminar program and to offer suggestions for future conferences. The evaluation ranged over a number of topics: the structure and organization of Seminars, the Seminar lectures, the discussion sessions, the display of materials, and the impact of Seminars on classrooms.

It was generally agreed that the organization of the Seminars had been satisfactory and appropriate for their stated purposes. With time and funds sufficient to hold only eight such programs, the decision to have a general orientation conference and seven state-wide or bi-state seminars was appropriate. Nevertheless, Seminars have not yet reached all states in the North Central area. If funds remain or as new funds become available, it was recommended that the Foreign Relations Project consider holding additional state-wide Seminars on Democracy and Totalitarianism. Participants suggested that follow-up Seminars might be held by state departments of public instruction, local colleges and universities, and/or local school systems. These conferences would be directed at the in-service training of teachers in one or more school systems and would have the purpose of implementing the recommendations of the state-wide Seminars.

The conferees agreed that participants had been carefully selected, even though the geographic distribution of the conferees could be improved in the future. While some differences were expressed on what the optimum quotas should be for scholars, teachers, and school administrators, it was thought that opportunities should be open to all. A specific suggestion by some was to invite teacher-administrator teams that could work on implementing the ideas of the Seminars after the conference. In deciding upon which people should be included in Seminars, the participants mentioned the advantages of inviting those who were well-established educational leaders, who by position of reputation were able to exert influence. Nevertheless, younger, less-experienced teachers, whose morale, teaching, and career might be enhanced by attending the seminars, should not be overlooked. It was proposed that the Project continue the practice of working through existing professional organizations and educational institutions both in identifying participants and in planning conferences.

The speakers, who addressed the various seminars, were considered to have been excellent -- thoroughly conversant with their topics and able to impart useful information to the participants who attended. Presentations by scholars set a tone for the seminar that the participants appreciated. There was some concern, however, that the lecture topics ranged too widely

B. EVALUATION CONFERENCE - Continued

across a spectrum of democratic and totalitarian societies. Because series of addresses at a single conference were at times varied, some Seminars appeared to lack focus. Therefore, attention might be given to structuring the lecture topics and content more carefully.

Four of the Seminars included a presentation demonstrating the inductive approach to teaching about totalitarianism. The conferees acknowledged the importance of giving some attention to applying abstract ideas and concepts to the classroom. They noted that the task is a difficult one.

One serious criticism voiced of the speakers was that in a few instances the lecturers gave their talks and left immediately without providing the participants with the opportunity to discuss the issues at length following the presentation. A dialogue between scholars and teachers can benefit both. It was urged that speakers be asked to stay for at least one full day at the conference.

The conferees were generally enthusiastic about the effectiveness of the discussion groups. A few objections were raised: discussions often lacked focus and direction, the leaders seemed uncertain of what the group was to accomplish, and some participants demanded more time than their contributions deserved. Despite these criticisms, it was agreed that the discussion groups were absolutely vital to the seminar approach. In this way only was one likely to secure sufficient commitment by teachers in order to get effective results.

In order to have the groups function at an optimum level, it was thought that the group leaders should be briefed on the role of the discussions early in the conference. The time within the discussion sessions might also be maximized by asking the discussion groups to focus on specific topics rather than leaving them free to roam at will as was sometimes the case. At the same time, it was pointed out that too much structure might kill spontaneity among its members.

Some discussion groups tended to be organized heterogenously as the problems to be discussed were usually in nature. In some seminars it might be preferable to organize hemogeneously, i.e. to have "job-alike" sessions for considering questions peculiar to each field or if teacher-administrator teams are at the Seminar, it might be best to keep a team together rather than separating them into different discussion groups. The size of the discussion groups and the nature of the participants should also be determined by the purpose of the discussion.

During the presentations, the discussion groups, and the informal conversations of the evaluation conference, participants testified to the influence of the Seminar programs on curriculum and instruction. Especially useful to the conferees were the lectures and demonstrations by Howard Mehlinger on his guide, TOTALITARIANISM: AN INDUCTIVE APPROACH. Participants appreciated the concrete classroom exercises that were creatively designed for use with students in developing concepts about democracy and totalitarianism.

B. EVALUATION CONFERENCE - Continued

The conferees also considered the materials which were made available to the Seminar participants. While it was agreed that a wide variety of materials had been displayed, it was suggested that the Project might include materials that were of a more innovative nature than the traditional kind of materials on display. More attention to transparencies, tapes, and evaluation tests seemed appropriate. An inclusive, annotated bibliography covering many of the sources in the field, would also have been useful for the participants. Moreover, interest was expressed in supplementing the present Seminar program with a discussion or explanation of materials. This might be achieved by calling on a participant or a resource person to describe or demonstrate how certain materials can be used effectively in the classroom.

In regards to the holding of future Seminars on Democracy and Totalitarianism, it was cautioned that the Project staff must not relax in its efforts to keep the Seminars consistent with new knowledge and information. Much has happened in the Soviet Union and elsewhere since 1963. What was appropriate to discuss under the heading of democracy and totalitarianism in 1963 may no longer be appropriate in 1966 and 1967. In line with the constantly changing developments in this field and in the social sciences, new topics for Seminars might be considered although there was still a need to hold Seminars on Democracy and Totalitarianism.

It was clear to all those attending the evaluation conference thatthe Democracy and Totalitarianism Seminars have contributed successfully to the resolution of a most difficult instructional problem facing the schools. In many ways the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project was the ideal organization to undertake this effort. As an accrediting agency for nineteen Mid-Western states, the NCA is well-known. Its position is respected and secure. School administrators usually respond favorably to programs it sponsors. The Foreign Relations Project has during the past ten years acquired considerable experience in how one initiates change in the social studies. Its Foreign Relations Series is widely used and highly regarded by secondary school social studies teachers. The web of contacts the Project has with university scholars, secondary teachers, state department of education personnel, and school administrators reaches across the country.

Because of its unique position in the American education hierarchy, the Foreign Relations Project is ideally situated to play the "honest broker" in encouraging educational innovation, such as was demonstrated by its sponsorship of the Seminars on Democracy and Totalitarianism. As important as innovation and implementation are in creating change, dissemination may be equally significant if the ideas of the innovators are to reach those who will put them into practice with students.

Considering the Foreign Relations Project's role in regards to improving the social studies and contacting schools, the Project might well consider other ways it can provide a service to education through the unique opportunities and resources at its disposal. For example, the possibility of organizing Seminars which would bring classroom teachers into contact with directors of curriculum centers for exploring implications of curriculum change might be considered. When a curriculum project disseminates

B. EVALUATION CONFERENCE - Continued

its own product, it is difficult to avoid the natural tendency to sell it. Teachers and administrators, on the other hand, need guidance in choosing among the many social studies packages appearing on the scene. They need to understand what the implications are for their programs when they accept one or the other approach.

The Foreign Relations Project might also seek ways to assist schools in meeting local curriculum demands. It might consider sponsoring a conference which would identify and bring together a group of people who are in a position to offer service to schools as consultants. Consultants, operating either as teams or acting individually, might agree to make themselves available on a long or short term basis according to guidelines agreed upon at the conference. The Project would make this group known to the schools and assist in making contacts. The money available to schools through Title III and Title IV of the National Defense Education Act makes this a realistic opportunity.

## C. FINAL SURVEY

The results of the Interim Survey and the Evaluation Conference clearly indicated that a concluding survey would also produce highly favorable responses to the Seminar series. The Final Survey, while continuing to accumulate supportive data, was designed to acquire some effects of time on Seminar productivity as well as the effects of professional interests in conceptualizing the Seminar and participant involvement. To do this the completed questionnaires were divided into four sub-sets: (1) Administrators; (2) Supervisors; (3) Classroom Teachers-Secondary; and (4) College Personel in Education and Social Science Fields. These sub-sets were further divided into four time periods:(1) The Academic Year 1964-65; (2) The Academic Year 1965-66; (3) The Academic Year 1966-67; and (4) The Academic Years 1967-68 and 1968-69.

Respondents were asked to rate the Seminars on five major categories: (1) General Assessments of the Seminars; (2) Organization and Structure of the Seminars; (3) Expository Aspects; (4) Seminar Discussions; and (5) Demonstrations and curriculum materials. Ratings were made on a scale:

(1) High Agreement.
(2) Agreement.
(3) No Opinion.
(4) Disagreement.
(5) High Disagreement.

Preceding the questionnaire and immediately following each major category, the respondents were encouraged to write comments representing their feelings about Seminar activities. Tables I-IX, Pages
report the respondents ratings of the Seminars by professional role and by time periods of attendance. High Agreement (1), and Agreement (2), have been reported as a single item--also High Disagreement (5), and Disagreement (4) -- to clarify the tabled information. As was anticipated, the Tables demonstrate the general endorsement of the Seminar activities. Item K on the questionnaire was negatively stated as a check against less

C. FINAL SURVEY - Continued

discriminatory reading and marking of the questionnaire. As noted in the Tables, the degree of disagreement with Item K supports the concensus of general endorsement of the Seminar program.

Viewing the data on Table IX, it is apparent that Seminar participants were less certain about the impact of Seminar activities on the curriculum. Item C -- "Residential Seminars of this type have produced changes in the social studies curriculum in your school" -- and Item N -- "The instructional materials on display proved of value to your school" received lower ratings in agreement and higher markings in no opinion. Data in Table IV, shows this to be true for classroom teachers in the case of Item C, but not true for Item N. It was not surprising that administrative, supervisory, and college personnel were uncertain about the impact of the display materials since they have little or no direct contact with secondary school students. However, since classroom teachers saw greater value in the materials, the curriculum impact may have been greater also. That is, changes occurred that were within existing curriculum structure but not reported as a curriculum revision.

In general, the tabled data illustrates a strong need for Seminars that intervene into traditional flows of social studies information and materials. What such questionnaires cannot illustrate are the dynamic qualities that have been reported in commentary sections. A select few of these enthusiastic statement are reported below as examples from classroom teachers, administrators, supervisors, and speakers.

Classroom Teacher Reports

Frederick M. Patterson, Social Studies Chairman, Waukegan Township High School, Illinois.

"The D & T Seminars attended were of prime value to our social studies instruction in our school. The work of the D & T Seminars was merged with much of the efforts of the Illinois Curriculum Study of Totalitarianism. The sessions provided for abundant exchange of techniques, materials, and philosophies of teaching in the subject area."

Harold E. Limper, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Belleville Township High School, Illinois.

"Although we did not change our curriculum specifically, many of the ideas expressed at the meeting were tried out and some were incorporated into existing courses. We also purchased some of the recommended paperback books. I have used the films in my classroom which were shown at the Seminar."

Lee Rosenquist, Social Studies Team Leader, Lincoln-Way Community High School, Illinois.

"Shortly after I attended the Seminar during the 1964-65 school year, I was charged with the responsibility of setting up a course that included an extensive unit entitled 'Democracy vs. Totalitarianism'. Many ideas that I liked during the Seminar were incorporated into this unit. In the years that this

Classroom Teacher Reports - Continued

unit has been taught, about 1200 students have benefited from my attendance at the Seminar."

Martha Wangberg, Social Studies Coordinator, Council Bluffs, Iowa.
"We have worked out a unit on Totalitarianism vs. Democracy at the senior level and experimented with materials at the 9th grade level. We have purchased some of the materials that were on display tables and are using them."

Janis Waxenberg, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Frost Junior High School, Michigan.
"We have used much of the cultural and anthropology materials I received at the Seminar. The ninth grade course now includes a unit on a Comparative Study of Totalitarianism and Democracy. This is a new approach for us. We use the 'inquiry method' and attempt to be inductive. This new thematic view is greeted more enthusiastically by students and teachers."

Robert W. Ask, American History Teacher, Jefferson High School, Iowa.
"Three of our social studies teachers, including myself, were privileged to attend the Seminar. For me--the one held in Lincoln, Nebraska, in November of 1965, was one of the most enriching and stimulating experiences in my professional career. The concepts learned, the motivation and enthusiasm it generated --these, I'm sure, were reflected in my subsequent instruction. Since then, for example, Ebenstein's materials have become an inherent part of our subject-matter in teaching 'totalitarianism', 'authoritarianism,' and 'democracy.' I hope these Seminars can continue. If it is ever possible for me to attend another such conference, I would consider it a high honor."

William Weathered, Audio-Visual Chairman, Roger Ludlowe High School, Connecticut.
"The conference proved to be a significant turning point in my life and as a result, has had impact on our whole system. The concept of the authoritarian mind as it was developed in the conference has had a great influence in changing my frame of reference on many things."

Dwain Myers, Experienced Teacher Fellow at Purdue, Nebraska.
"The primary result of the state meeting in Lincoln, Nebraska was a series of meetings held at various places in the state to reach a wide base of social studies teachers. These were well attended, but were late in the spring and since I left the Hastings, Nebraska community then it would be difficult to assess the impact."

Pascal Trohanis, Social Studies Teacher, Coleytown Junior High School, Connecticut.
"Program was <u>extremely</u> valuable; speakers were superb, interaction with other teachers was worthwhile, using Mehlinger materials as a consequence, and many other ideas. Beautiful'"

Classroom Teacher Reports - Continued

Barbara J. Tattersall, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Cumberland High School, Rhode Island.

"These Seminars were held at the ideal time for the Cumberland High School Social Studies Department. We were discussing grades 7-12 curriculum revision and these Seminars plus the resources (materials, info about other projects, etc.), introduced to us via the Seminars gave me the confidence, the ammunition to get the revision ideas into reality. The 9 other department members used all the ideas and materials I obtained and we now have a more coordinated and enriched 7-12 curriculum outlined."

Sister Mary Constance Murray, Social Studies Chairman and Instructor, Columbus High School, Iowa.

"The program has been very beneficial for our community. Several of the teachers from this area have attended different Seminars and all have the greatest appreciation for having had the privilege of attending. The general consensus is that they have never spent time more profitably. It is a big advantage to have a person from a respective country presenting the views of his country as you did in the Seminar in Iowa City. I am most grateful for the experiences furnished by the NCA Foreign Relations Project. It has been more useful to me than any one other Educational Meeting."

Mary Grace Soccio, Classroom Teacher, McMurray High School, Pennsylvania.

"Perhaps the greatest value of this type of Seminar resides in its ability to generate a more vital intellectual stimulation not only during the conference but also for many weeks susequent. My personal participation resulted in an easy adaptation and installation of an up-dated social studies series in our school's primary grades. Demonstrations of teaching techniques, acquaintance with new materials, simulation--all made the transition neatly fluid. The program was handled with and characterized by professionalism."

Thomas E. Churchwell, Social Studies Teacher, Keokuk Junior High School, Iowa.

"The Seminar series helped me very much in my teaching of current events and also in relating contemporary history to past history. At the Seminar I was introduced to the latest scholarship and research in the field by leading authorities. The presentation of the latest teaching methods and techniques especially the simulation methods and techniques were very, very meaningful. I sincerely believe this Seminar made me a more effective teacher and I feel I derived great benefit from my attendance. I would highly recommend this series be continued."

Administrators Reports

A. N. Addleman, Assistant Superintendent of Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Administrators Reports - Continued

"The materials of the conference were very practical in Seminars for local teachers in the social studies. The idea of the Seminar provides suggestions for Seminars on the local level. Many teachers should have greater access to materials such as distributed at the Seminar. Possibly, this type of Seminar is the pattern for efficient Seminars on the local level. The only criticism that I could give such a Seminar would be that several individuals were not prepared for participation in such efficiently structured programs. As a result, much time is lost in an attempt to bring these individuals to an effective understanding of the discourse."

Victor E. Solheim, Assistant Superintendent, Bismarck Public Schools, North Dakota.

"The information gathered at the Seminar was shared with six social science teachers at the high school level. The participants also spent two days as a guest lecturerswith the high school seniors during the time they were comparing communism and democracy. If such Seminars are held in the future, we would appreciate having our social science people included."

Homer Higbee, Assistant Dean, Education Exchange Center for International Programs, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

"It is now several years since our Seminar, and I continue to receive occasional notes from participants, or when I see some of the participants they pass on very favorable comments about the impact of that particular Seminar on their own thinking about the teaching of social studies. This, I think, is what all of us hoped for, and to the extent these views have been diffused among colleagues who did not participate, we certainly can say we succeeded."

Charles W. Schuerger, Director of Secondary Education, Evansville, Indiana.

"Several curriculum projects have been instituted in our schools, which may be attributed to the Seminar's influences -- (1) An advanced World History course with emphasis on non-Western areas; (2) Two independent study programs in social studies; (3) Many newer materials have been acquired--books, films, etc.; and (4) Many in-service workshops on Asiatic studies have been held."

College Personnel Reports

Jovan Brkić, Professor of Philosophy, North Dakota State University.

"The impact of the Seminar in this area was great. As a result of the Seminar one of the topics for the annual meeting of North Dakota Educational Association (1967), was 'Democracy and Totalitarianism', a topic inspired and borrowed from the Seminar."

Lee A. Witters, Assistant Professor of Secondary Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

"A number of spin-off or area Seminars were held in Nebraska as a follow-up to the General Seminar at the Nebraska Center. As director of the Lincoln Area Seminar, I feel we were able to reach a large number of teachers we would otherwise not been

College Personnel Reports - Continued

"...been able to reach. Feedback from the participants indicates that most of the teachers found the sessions and materials most helpful and have incorporated some of the ideas and materials into their classrooms."

Robert M. Fitch, Assistant Professor, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
"The interest in, and use of, simulation as a teaching procedure has been greatly increased. Teachers who were apprehensive about simulation learned by participating and have even produced simple efforts of their own in the classroom."

Robert H. Baldwin, Assistant Professor, Foundations of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
"Since I'm not teaching social studies either in the public schools or in educational methods, it is difficult for me to make an assessment of the impact of the conference on social studies instruction. In my narrower community of educating students I have used to some advantage many of the ideas advanced in the Seminar that I attended. By using some of the Fenton-Oliver-Edgar-Raths models in social science, I have been able to give some concrete examples in the social studies field of some more primitive theoretical problems. The values-valuing paradigm has also been useful in teaching the whole area of morality and moral education."

Donald A. Scovel, Chairman, Social Studies Area, Price Laboratory School, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
"The Seminar Series conducted by the Foreign Relations Project, NCA, proved to be tremendously helpful to the teachers in the State of Iowa who participated in them. Seemingly, there has been no restriction as to social studies courses affected. Teachers of history, economics, government, sociology have indicated an interest and have reported some motivation, either from personally attending or benefiting from the reports of teachers who had attended. Generally, throughout the state there has been one criticism; there should have been more held so as to benefit a larger number of teachers."

Margaret Carter, Instructor, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.
"One of the complaints of young teachers is that they are not creative. The materials distributed at the Seminar are extremely useful in demonstrating to them both the new content and well-developed lesson suggestions. The Mehlinger book, for example, has been a popular source used by numerous student teachers. In this geographic area no other organization was available to spread this particular word. The Seminars have received a high 'in-service' rating from the teachers who were allowed to attend."

David H. Makinson, Associate Professor of Student Teaching, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.
"I found the availability of materials at the Seminars a great help in enlightening me to a number of sources and findings

College Personnel Reports - Continued

"...which heretofore I had not known. As a teacher of methods, I cannot be sure of my direct impact even upon my own students who in turn are teachers in the community. To the degree that my awareness was heightened, I can only hope that I was able to pass this on to others. The opportunity to compare notes with others active in the social studies and in the various international groups around the country was of particular value and I am indebted to you for these opportunities."

Jack Cousins, Associate Professor, Indiana University, Bloomington.
"The Seminar was very beneficial to those who attended. There was, however, little effort made to disseminate the results to teachers not in attendance. The Indiana Social Studies Quarterly was the only effort to 'spread the world.' The various Seminar papers might be collected, edited and made available in a paperback volume."

Samuel Richey Kamm, Professor of History and Social Science, Wheaton College, Illinois.
"The Seminar which I attended at Zion, Illinois, provided orientation for some of my work in conducting the course Teaching The Social Studies, and in preparing materials for a workshop for teachers on American Constitutionalism and Modern Communism that was conducted during the Wheaton College Summer Session of 1963, 1964, and 1965."

Supervisors Reports

June V. Gulliard, Associate State Supervisor of Social Studies, Raleigh, North Carolina.
"We are at present involved in revising the State social studies curriculum, grades K-12. While it is too early to assess the real impact the Seminar held in Morgantown will have on our revised program, I feel certain that it will greatly influence the kinds of questions we will ask and the decisions we will ultimately make concerning curriculum content and organization."

Sheldon L. Brown, History and Social Science Consultant, Nebraska State Department of Education, Lincoln.
"It is my opinion that the Seminars held in Nebraska were quite successful. Most of the participants have since related to me a very positive reaction. In my continuing contact with these participants, concrete evidence of their use of the ideas and some of the materials is observable."

Charles F. Sheets, Consultant for Social Studies, Fort Wayne Community Schools, Indiana.
"The outstanding quality of this series was the assistance which it offered in the adaptation of teaching strategies and materials to the needs of slow learners. The report which resulted from the Terre Haute meeting has been used for teacher in-service training."

Supervisors Reports - Continued

A. P. Sonstegard, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Watertown Senior High School, South Dakota.

"(1) Heightened our desire and effort to improve the content and quality of our social studies curriculum; (2) Prompted us to relate new approaches to our teachers--we have made a special effort to encourage teachers to become familiar with and to effectively use the inquiry approach. Teachers have been particularly impressed by Mehlinger's inductive approach."

Wentworth Clarke, Social Studies Curriculum Consultant, Board of Education, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

"I can honestly say that no other project or effort has done more in a practical way for the system in its efforts to revise its curriculum and interpret the social studies revolution."

William T. Nimroth, Coordinator for Social Studies, Ann Arbor Public Schools, Michigan.

"The subject area of the Seminar remains a crucial one in the United States today. Too few teachers see the potential for learning experiences of great value in this topic. The assumption is made that knowing the structure of our government will answer all questions."

John P. Dix, Consultant, Secondary Social Studies, Kansas City, Missouri.

"In fact, our curriculum guide and our instructional materials have been influenced by the Seminars and Conferences. Thus, the value and impact of the Seminars has been tremendous and fundamental."

## CONCLUSIONS

While it is difficult to impossible to measure the impact of the seminars on "Democracy and Totalitarianism," the nature of the participants' responses and comments suggests the need for a continuous on-going stimulus in social studies education. The natural vehicle for in-service programs has always existed in the state departments of education and university extension centers. Unfortunately, the former does not command the educator's respect--at least in most states--and the latter has been too embroiled in academic struggles and have not directed programs toward teacher needs.

Undoubtedly, the NCA Foreign Relations Project enjoyed exceptional success because:

1) The North Central Association has a close identity with the administrative personnel that free teachers for seminar participation.

2) The Foreign Relations Project has had a long history of quality programs and enjoyed a high degree of respect among social studies teachers.

3) The Foreign Relations Project did not languish under the restraints of abstract academic thought nor the narrow perceptions of educational bureaucracies.

Therefore, there is one obvious conclusion that can be translated into a recommendation. There is an urgent need for a continuing program of intervention seminars that provides for the dissemination of a plethora of social studies materials on a wide range of topics. For the intervention to be successful, the agency of intervention needs to be identified outside the bureaucratic controls of state and local agencies.

* * *

# TABLE I

## SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL ATTENDING SEMINARS OVER ALL TIME PERIODS

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT * (1) & (2) | NO OPINION ** (3) | DISAGREEMENT *** (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. The pre-conference materials that were distributed were appropriately related to school needs. | 18 | 1 | 0 |
| B. Ideas and materials presented at the Seminar were circulated among colleagues who were not participants. | 17 | 2 | 0 |
| C. Residential Seminars of this type have produced changes in the social studies curriculum in your school. | 16 | 2 | 0 |
| D. Expository and participatory sessions were appropriately balanced. | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| E. The Seminar was held at an appropriate time and place. | 17 | 1 | 1 |
| F. The Seminar activities clearly related to the overall purpose of the conference. | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| G. The lectures were appropriately balanced between democratic and totalitarian models. | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| H. The speakers presented concepts and models related to curriculum needs. | 19 | 0 | 1 |
| I. The concepts and models that were presented were practical rather than abstract. | 15 | 4 | 1 |
| J. The discussions were valuable exchanges of ideas about curriculum patterns and needs. | 18 | 2 | 0 |
| @K. Pre-conference questions forced discussion to be too tightly structured. | 4 | 4 | 12 |

T A B L E  I - Continued

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT * (1) & (2) | NO OPINION ** (3) | DISAGREEMENT *** (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| L. Demonstrations of teaching strategies (frequently Howard Mehlinger's presentation) were easily related to classroom needs. | 19 | 0 | 1 |
| M. Additional demonstrations of teaching techniques would have been beneficial. | 18 | 1 | 1 |
| N. The instructional materials on display proved of value to your school. | 16 | 4 | 0 |

* Those marking (1) HIGH AGREEMENT and (2) AGREEMENT.
** Those marking (3) NO OPINION.
*** Those marking (4) DISAGREEMENT and (5) HIGH DISAGREEMENT.

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore <u>disagreement</u> responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E  II

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL ATTENDING SEMINARS OVER ALL TIME PERIODS.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.)

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| B | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| C | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| D | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| F | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| G | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| H | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| I | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| J | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| @K | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| L | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| M | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| N | 6 | 1 | 1 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

T A B L E  III

COLLEGE PERSONNEL ATTENDING SEMINARS OVER ALL TIME PERIODS.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.)

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 18 | 0 | 2 |
| B | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| C | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| D | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| F | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| G | 14 | 3 | 2 |
| H | 16 | 1 | 3 |
| I | 15 | 0 | 4 |
| J | 17 | 2 | 0 |
| @K | 1 | 2 | 13 |
| L | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| M | 11 | 2 | 3 |
| N | 7 | 4 | 2 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E  IV

## CLASSROOM TEACHERS ATTENDING SEMINARS OVER ALL TIME PERIODS.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 42 | 2 | 4 |
| B | 37 | 2 | 8 |
| C | 30 | 9 | 7 |
| D | 45 | 1 | 2 |
| E | 44 | 2 | 2 |
| F | 45 | 1 | 2 |
| G | 39 | 5 | 3 |
| H | 41 | 2 | 6 |
| I | 33 | 5 | 8 |
| J | 38 | 6 | 4 |
| @K | 7 | 11 | 28 |
| L | 32 | 9 | 8 |
| M | 38 | 3 | 5 |
| N | 37 | 7 | 5 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E  V

## RESPONDENTS ATTENDING SEMINARS IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1964-65.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 15 | 0 | 1 |
| B | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| C | 11 | 1 | 2 |
| D | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| F | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| G | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| H | 13 | 0 | 4 |
| I | 10 | 2 | 5 |
| J | 15 | 3 | 0 |
| @K | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| L | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| M | 11 | 1 | 4 |
| N | 13 | 2 | 1 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E  VI

## RESPONDENTS ATTENDING SEMINARS IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1965-66.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 25 | 6 | 3 |
| B | 23 | 2 | 1 |
| C | 19 | 4 | 3 |
| D | 28 | 0 | 1 |
| E | 27 | 2 | 0 |
| F | 28 | 1 | 0 |
| G | 25 | 2 | 1 |
| H | 27 | 2 | 1 |
| I | 25 | 2 | 2 |
| J | 26 | 4 | 0 |
| @K | 5 | 3 | 17 |
| L | 21 | 3 | 2 |
| M | 23 | 1 | 3 |
| N | 21 | 4 | 2 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E VII

## RESPONDENTS ATTENDING SEMINARS IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1966-67.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 26 | 1 | 2 |
| B | 19 | 4 | 4 |
| C | 16 | 7 | 3 |
| D | 27 | 1 | 1 |
| E | 27 | 0 | 2 |
| F | 27 | 0 | 2 |
| G | 29 | 3 | 1 |
| H | 23 | 2 | 4 |
| I | 18 | 3 | 6 |
| J | 24 | 2 | 2 |
| @K | 2 | 6 | 22 |
| L | 18 | 4 | 2 |
| M | 24 | 4 | 3 |
| N | 13 | 7 | 5 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E  VIII

## RESPONDENTS ATTENDING SEMINARS IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-69.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 21 | 1 | 0 |
| B | 19 | 0 | 3 |
| C | 15 | 6 | 0 |
| D | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 20 | 1 | 1 |
| F | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| G | 15 | 3 | 3 |
| H | 20 | 1 | 1 |
| I | 17 | 3 | 1 |
| J | 19 | 1 | 2 |
| @K | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| L | 15 | 5 | 3 |
| M | 20 | 1 | 0 |
| N | 20 | 1 | 0 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# T A B L E IX

TOTAL RESPONSES FOR ALL RESPONDENTS SAMPLED OVER ALL TIME PERIODS.

(STATEMENTS are now listed "A", "B", "C", etc. Refer to T A B L E I for full content.

| STATEMENT | AGREEMENT (1) & (2) | NO OPINION (3) | DISAGREEMENT (4) & (5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 87 | 3 | 6 |
| B | 75 | 7 | 8 |
| C | 60 | 18 | 9 |
| D | 94 | 1 | 0 |
| E | 89 | 3 | 3 |
| F | 93 | 1 | 2 |
| G | 74 | 11 | 6 |
| H | 83 | 5 | 10 |
| I | 70 | 10 | 14 |
| J | 82 | 10 | 4 |
| @K | 14 | 18 | 58 |
| L | 75 | 16 | 10 |
| M | 74 | 7 | 10 |
| N | 66 | 16 | 8 |

@K -- is a negatively stated item, therefore disagreement responses should be considered positive responses.

# A SERIES OF SEMINARS ON DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIANISM

AN

INTERIM

REPORT

OCTOBER 1965

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

–

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
FOREIGN RELATIONS PROJECT

# SEMINARS ON DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIANISM

–

# AN INTERIM REPORT

by

James M. Becker
Director, NCA Foreign Relations Project

## INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, the study of totalitarianism has increasingly come to be regarded as a vital part of the high school curriculum. Scores of new programs have arisen dealing with totalitarianism or, more often, contrasting totalitarianism and democratic ideologies and political systems. In response to these new developments, Northwestern University and the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project initiated a series of seminars designed to explore new ways of teaching about democracy and totalitarianism, and to examine new materials and content. The program of seminars is financed through a grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

There will be a total of eight, three-day Seminars during the period from September, 1964 to June, 1966. All Seminars follow the same pattern. The Seminar is held on or near the campus of a state university, state college, or other educational center. Approximately 40-60 conferees – picked from the educational leadership represented in such organizations and agencies as state principals' and administrators' organizations, acknowledged leader schools, social studies organizations, state departments of public instruction, The North Central Association, and colleges and universities – are invited to attend. While the majority of participants are teachers, a good proportion of administrators, curriculum supervisors and coordinators, personnel from state educational agencies and organizations, and instructors in social studies at the college level also participate.

Selection is on a state-wide basis for the seminars in Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan. Participants will be drawn from a two-state area for three seminars: Minnesota-Wisconsin, Iowa-Nebraska, and Kansas-Missouri. The first seminar included key educators from throughout the nineteen-state North Central area.

Prior to attending a Seminar, participants receive and are required to read TOTALITARIANISM: NEW PERSPECTIVES, by William Ebenstein; THE POWER OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA, the Rockefeller Panel Report; and other appropriate materials. During each Seminar, selected materials – curriculum outlines, books, pamphlets, bibliographies, etc. – are displayed.

The agenda for all Seminars is the same. The Seminars open with dinner on Sunday evening, and close on Tuesday afternoon. There are four major presentations of one hour or more, each given by a distinguished historian or social scientist. The scholars are selected on a nationwide basis. Each presentation is followed by a discussion session. Participants are assigned to one of three discussion groups which remain constant throughout the seminar. The scholars serve as resource persons during the discussions. Summaries are made of each discussion, and these are compiled into a Final Report which represents the major findings, recommendations, and conclusions of the conference. The final plenary session of the Seminar is devoted to the presentation of the Final Report to the participants, its revision and approval.

The Report, together with abstracts of the lectures, a copy of the agenda, and a list of participants, is distributed to every high school in the state(s). A sample is attached.

| PARTICIPANTS IN THE SEMINARS | | ZION | U. OF ILLINOIS | INDIANA U | U. OF KANSAS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TEACHERS | 97 | 14 | 27 | 33 | 23 |
| CHAIRMEN – SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENTS * | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| CURRICULUM DIRECTORS, COORDINATORS (SCHOOL AND CITY) | 7 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| ADMINISTRATORS, SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS | 26 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 1 |
| STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| SCHOOLS, COLLEGES OF EDUCATION * | 14 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| HISTORIANS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS | 31 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 |
| ADMINISTRATORS – COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| NCA OR NCSS STATE OFFICER | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 204 | 37 | 48 | 74 | 45 |

* PARTICIPANTS IN MORE THAN 1 CATEGORY, EG. MOST DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN ARE TEACHERS

NCA Foreign Relations Project

832 / 38 South Dearborn Street / Chicago, Illinois 60603

A SERIES OF SEMINARS

ON

DEMOCRACY

AND

TOTALITARIANISM

# REPORT OF EVALUATION SEMINAR ON DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIANISM

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

–

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
FOREIGN RELATIONS PROJECT

AUGUST 25 AND 26, 1966 – ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK LODGE – ZION, ILLINOIS

## FOREWORD

In 1964 the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project and Northwestern University, received a grant from the U.S. Office of Education to conduct a series of experimental state-wide seminars on "Teaching About Democracy and Totalitarianism." On August 25 and 26, 1966, twenty-eight social studies teachers, supervisors, administrators, and social scientists, who had attended one or more of the experimental seminars, met at Zion, Illinois, to examine varied aspects of the seminar program.

Preceding the evaluation conference, the participants were provided with reports of a questionnaire study conducted by the Project. During the conference, the conferees heard brief presentations on: (1) the organization and structure of the seminars; (2) the nature and variety of the lectures; (3) the structure and content of the discussion sessions; (4) the quantity and quality of display materials; and (5) the overall impact of the conferences. The talks were followed by small group discussion sessions exploring questions raised by the speakers. A summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the discussion groups was presented at the final session of the conference.

## BACKGROUND NOTES:

During the early 1960's, secondary schools manifested growing concern for curricular emphasis on the study of democratic and totalitarian systems. As social studies curriculums began to emphasize concepts in this area, educators sought to identify resource materials and teaching strategies which provided objective bases for new courses or units.

To meet this need, the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project and Northwestern University, with a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, sponsored a series of experimental state-wide seminars on the topic. Objectives of the seminars were:

(1) to identify some of the problems in teaching about democracy and totalitarianism,

(2) to enable scholars to convey some of the latest research on democratic and totalitarian countries to the secondary schools,

(3) to examine materials available in this field for teachers and students,

(4) to explore a variety of methods which could be employed in teaching about democracy and totalitarianism,

(5) to consider where and when democracy and totalitarianism should be included in the curriculum,

(6) to establish greater communication among teachers, administrators, and college faculty so that the instruction in this area and others could be improved,

(7) to encourage those attending the conference to evaluate their situation and make the necessary changes,

(8) to disseminate reports reflecting the procedure and recommendations of each seminar in order to inform people not attending of the developments in this area, and

(9) to demonstrate the seminar method as an effective means for exploring existing materials and for developing alternative approaches to the study of democracy and totalitarianism.

With these objectives in mind, eight two-day seminars were held between September, 1964, and June, 1966, within the 19 states of the North Central area. The first seminar consisted of educators representing the entire region. Four of the seminars were held on a state-wide basis in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, and the remaining three covered the two-state areas of Minnesota-Wisconsin, Iowa-Nebraska, and Kansas-Missouri. Each conference was attended by a select group of 50 to 60 social studies teachers, administrators, state department personnel, and college specialists. Of the 423 educators attending these conferences, about half were social studies teachers and the rest were evenly divided between administrators and college faculty.

The seminars followed a similar format. Pre-seminar materials, consisting of William Ebenstein's Totalitarianism: New Perspectives and the Rockefeller Panel Report No. 6, entitled The Power of the Democratic Idea, were mailed to participants. Over the three-day period, a series of four lectures were given by social scientists. Three of the presentations focused upon recent research on democratic and totalitarian states, and the fourth was devoted to teaching strategies and methods. Formal presentations were followed by one to two-hour discussion sessions in which the participants (1) considered questions raised by the speakers, (2) discussed the advantages and disadvantages of various teaching approaches, and (3) questioned the need for curriculum changes. A summary of the four discussion sessions was drafted and presented to all participants at a final plenary session. During the conference, participants were also to review display materials consisting of bibliographies, curriculum studies, outlines, books and pamphlets. After the

conference, participants received a final report which included brief accounts of the formal presentations and the summary statement.

## THE PROGRAM

In the orientation session, James M. Becker, the former Director of the NCA Foreign Relations Project and now Director of School Services for the Foreign Policy Association, described changes in the environment for teaching about democracy and totalitarianism since 1963 when the proposal for the seminars was first submitted. During the early part of the 1960's, courses and units on this subject were just beginning to appear. At that time educators felt a need to clarify teaching objectives, to improve the instruction of controversial topics, to identify objective materials, to plan and participate in in-service programs, and to increase their communication with social scientists.

Over the past three years the climate for instruction has been constantly changing. Today teachers, supervisors and administrators are engaged in examining their objectives in presenting democracy and totalitarianism in the high schools. Many schools are in the process of revising courses and units on communism. Although totalitarianism is still considered an extremely controversial topic, schools are agreed that students should be informed about both democratic and totalitarian systems. The publication of a wide variety of teaching materials suitable for the high schools has also changed the picture. With grants from the government under the National Defense Education Act, schools have been able to purchase both written materials and visual aids. In addition, the public news media has provided articles and programs analyzing the trends and events in democratic and totalitarian countries. These sources of information have therefore complemented the international materials. Finally, funds have been made available for teacher institutes, which serve both to inform teachers as well as to involve scholars in high school social studies.

A brief talk on "The Seminar Technique: Organization and Structure" was given by Mary B. Humphreys, Editor, NCA Foreign Relations Project. In the planning of the seminars, it was decided that conferences should be held at locations which were both central to the geographic distribution of participants and close to the host institutions, usually state universities. Each seminar was to last three days: two days during the week and one day on the weekend. By having a short conference, it was hoped that teachers and administrators alike could attend.

Participants for each of the conferences were chosen on the basis of their roles in social studies organizations and school administrations. Names of teachers and administrators were submitted by the state university college of education and other local educational institutions. Because both the size and number of seminars were limited, the planners felt that participants should be selected according to their ability to produce change in the social studies program.

John Thompson, Department of History, Indiana University, analyzed the nature and variety of the seminar lectures. In reviewing the lectures given at all eight seminars, Dr. Thompson found that the presentations served one or more purposes: to impart new information, to disseminate new interpretations, and or to arouse interest in the subject.

A majority of the talks focused on totalitarianism as opposed to democracy: approximately 40 were on totalitarianism compared to 20 on democracy. Their content covered a wide range of ideas and concepts about democracy and totalitarianism. In many cases the addresses tended to be abstract and the theoretical concepts were not usually illustrated by events in the real world. When examples were employed, the United States was generally cited as the case for a democratic country and the Soviet Union was often chosen to illustrate totalitarian concepts. Dr. Thompson suggested that in the future more attention be devoted to the range of societies actually represented by the theories. He also recommended that speakers mention the value systems under which they were operating and enumerate the assumptions implicit in their arguments. Furthermore, the lectures could represent more disciplines and some of the latest approaches, such as the behavioral approach. In addition, the talks could do more in showing how the information or approach presented is related to the curriculum of the secondary schools.

The presentation on seminar discussions was given by Gerald Marker, Coordinator for Social Studies at Indiana University. Mr. Marker noted that although discussion groups provide an opportunity for members to participate and for a variety of viewpoints to be heard, they also have disadvantages. To begin with, the quality of the discussion leaders can vary. All leaders are not able to maintain the interest of the group nor are they able to guide the discussion effectively

In a discussion group, one or more of its members may monopolize the discussion. Moreover, some educators may dwell on teaching problems in their own schools. Finally, there is the problem of deciding how the group will approach the discussion of a given subject.

Having described some of the deficiencies of the discussion method, Mr. Marker went on to consider ways in which the sessions might be improved. Depending on the topic involved, the group might meet before the general presentations rather than afterwards. The composition of the groups could be kept fluid by assigning participants to different groups at each meeting. Certain topics might receive better considerations in "job-alike" sessions, i.e. putting teachers in one group and administrators in another. Finally, the length of the discussion sessions could be varied according to the topic and purpose. The first discussion meeting could be brief and serve primarily to introduce the participants to one another. Later meetings may be longer as the participants become involved with other subjects.

One general session of the evaluation seminar was devoted to a report by three panelists on the impact of the democracy and totalitarianism seminars. The first speaker was Dr. Wentworth Clarke, a Curriculum Consultant for the Cedar Rapids Community School District. In his talk Dr. Clarke noted that his school district was in the process of revising the social studies curriculum when several teachers received invitations to attend one of the seminars. The teachers and administrators alike were very open to suggestions for new ideas, materials, and methods. While attending the seminar, the participants from Cedar Rapids identified ideas which could be used in their courses. An example given was that all twentieth century nations and beliefs fall on a continuum between the ideal models of democracy and totalitarianism. Also extremely helpful to the Cedar Rapids social studies teachers was Howard Mehlinger's demonstration and lecture on his guide, Totalitarianism: The Inductive Approach. Parts of this guide were applied in several courses.

Another member on the panel was Mr. Charles A. Loparo, State Department of Education, Ohio. Having attended the Ohio seminar on Democracy and Totalitarianism in April, 1966, the speaker made a few suggestions on how this particular seminar could have been improved. He pointed out that of the 38 participants who attended this conference, eight were in the program and many of the others came from the same school district or school. He recommended that more consultation with local organizations in the sate might enable future seminars to have a more representative selection of educators from throughout the state, thus enhanci the impact of the conference.

Mr. Loparo also pointed out that although the planning of the seminar might have been altered in certain ways, the conference, nevertheless, had had a considerable influence on the teaching about democracy and totalitarianism in Ohio. Teachers were employing ideas, methods, and materials from the seminar in their classrooms. Furthermore, some of the educators who had been participants at the seminar were later involved in setting up a state-wide international education conference that would be followed by seminars at the local level.

Patrick Struve, formerly a teacher in Iowa City, Iowa, and presently at Burris School, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, discussed the affect of the seminars on classroom teaching. After attending the Nebraska seminar, Mr. Struve re-evaluated his course on world affairs. Ebenstein's book, Totalitarianism: New Perspectives, was utilized with greater success than it had been before the conference. In the same course, the unit on totalitarianism was expanded from thr to six weeks. A major factor in the revision of this course and a world history course was Howard Mehlinger's demonstration and guide on Totalitarianism: An Inductive Approach.

The portion of the seminars devoted to materials was presented by Julius Hovany, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois. Mr. Hovany outlined various categories of materials that were displayed, listing specific publications within each category. Materials available at the conferences included: factual sources for teachers, informative publications for students, instructional guides and outlines, and information on audio-visual aids. The participants at some seminars viewed films pertinent to the study of democracy and totalitarianism and saw demonstrations on the use of transparencies, slides, and other visuals.

After enumerating the kinds of materials, Mr. Hovany suggested that future conferences present more publications on democracy and additional materials on totalitarianism in non-communist countries. Furthermore, more information film strips, transparencies, records, and tapes would be helpful.

## SEMINAR ON DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIANISM

The Seminar is made possible through a grant from the
U. S. Office of Education

### DISCUSSION LEADERS

Roger Niemeyer
North Central High School, Indianapolis, Indiana
Robert A. Waller
History Dept., University of Illinois, Champaign

### PROGRAM

**THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 1966**

11:00 - 12:00 P.M. – REGISTRATION
12:00 - 1:15 P.M. – Luncheon
1:15 - 2:00 P.M. – GENERAL SESSION I
Presiding – James D. Logsdon, Superintendent, Thornton Township High Schools, Harvey, Illinois
Orientation – James M. Becker, Director, School Service, Foreign Policy Association, New York, N.Y.
"The Seminar Technique: Organization and Structure"
Mary B. Humphreys, Editor, NCA Foreign Relations Project
2:00 - 3:00 P.M. – DISCUSSION SESSION I
3:00 - 3:15 P.M. – Coffee Break
3:15 - 3:40 P.M. – GENERAL SESSION II
Presiding – Neal M. Wherry, Lawrence, Kansas
"Lectures and Addresses: Nature and Variety"
John Thompson, Department of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
3:40 - 5:00 P.M. – DISCUSSION SESSION II
6:00 - 7:00 P.M. – Dinner
7:00 - 7:25 P.M. – GENERAL SESSION III
Presiding – J. Edgar Stonecipher, Department of Education, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa
"Discussion Sessions: Structure and Productivity"
Gerald Marker, Coordinator for Social Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
7:25 P.M. – DISCUSSION SESSION III

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 1966**

9:00 - 10:00 A.M. – GENERAL SESSION IV
Presiding – Walter L. Cooper, Superintendent, J. Sterling Morton High School, Cicero, Illinois
Panel – Wentworth Clarke, Curriculum Consultant, Cedar Rapids Comm. School District, Iowa
Charles A. Loparo, Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio
Patrick Struve, Burris School, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
10:00 - 10:15 A.M. – Coffee Break
10:15 - 10:40 A.M. – GENERAL SESSION V
Presiding – Jerry R. Moore, Director, NCA Foreign Relations Project
"Methods and Materials: Quality and Quantity"
Julius Hovany, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois
10:40 - 11:45 A.M. – DISCUSSION SESSION IV
12:00 - 1:00 P.M. – Luncheon
1:30 - 2:30 P.M. – PLENARY SESSION
Presiding – Jerry R. Moore
Summary – Howard Mehlinger, Director, High School Curriculum Center in Government, Bloomington, Indiana.
– Daniel Eckberg, Hopkins High School, Hopkins, Minnesota.

## PARTICIPANTS

JAMES M. BECKER, Director, School Services, Foreign Policy Assoc., 345 E. 46th Street, New York, New York 10017

RICHARD S. BEYER, Lakewood High School, Lakewood, Ohio

SHELDON BROWN, Social Studies Consultant, Dept. of Education, State House, Lincoln, Nebraska

WENTWORTH CLARKE, Curriculum Consultant, Cedar Rapids Comm. School District, 346 Second Ave., Cedar Rapids, Iowa

TOM COLLINS, School Services, Foreign Policy Association, 345 E. 46th Street, New York, New York 10017

WALTER L. COOPER, Supt., J. Sterling Morton High School, 2423 S. Austin Blvd., Cicero, Illinois 60650

MONA M. CUNNINGHAM, Cass Technical High School, Detroit, Michigan

JOHN P. DIX, Supervisor, Social Studies, Kansas City Public Schools, 9th and Locust Street, Kansas City, Missouri

E. DANIEL ECKBERG, Hopkins High School, Hopkins, Minnesota

GEORGE WAYNE GLIDDEN, Asst. Prof. of Secondary Education, University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska

JULIUS HOVANY, Office of Public Instruction, 160 N. LaSalle Street, Room 1800, Chicago, Illinois

STELLA KERN, 1400 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60610

JOHN H. KILGORE, Supervisor of Social Science, 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50307

JACK D. LINDEN, Cherry Creek High School, 4801 S. Boston Street, Englewood, Colorado

JAMES D. LOGSDON, Supt., Thornton Township High Schools, 151st and Broadway, Harvey, Illinois

CHARLES A. LOPARO, Department of Education, State of Ohio, 751 Northwest Blvd., Columbus, Ohio

DAVID H. MAKINSON, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202

GERALD MARKER, Coordinator for Social Studies, Lindley Hall 101G, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

HOWARD D. MEHLINGER, Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

ROGER NIEMEYER, North Central High School, 1801 E. 76th Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

PAUL SCHMUCKER, Penn High School, 56100 Bittersweet Road, Mishawaka, Indiana

J. EDGAR STONECIPHER, Department of Education, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

PATRICK STRUVE, Burris School, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

JOHN THOMPSON, Department of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

ROBERT A. WALLER, Department of History, 355 Armory Bldg., University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois

NEAL M. WHERRY, 1620 West 20th Street, Lawrence, Kansas

NCA FOREIGN RELATIONS PROJECT

JERRY R. MOORE, Director

MARY B. HUMPHREYS, Editor

NCA FOREIGN RELATIONS PROJECT – Room 740 – 53 West Jackson Blvd. – Chicago, Illinois 60604